DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 274 CG 015 443

AUTHOR Korabik, Karen
TITLE Androgyny and Leadership: An Integration.
SPONS AGENCY Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE Mar 81
GRANT SSHRC-410-80-0218
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for Women in Psychology (8th, Boston, MA, March 5-8, 1981). Best copy available.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Androgyny; Foreign Countries; Group Dynamics; *Group Experience; *Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; Personality Traits; Predictor Variables; *Sex Differences; *Sex Role
IDENTIFIERS Canada

ABSTRACT

Research indicates that sex role orientation may be a better predictor of leadership behavior than biological sex. To provide support for the integration of sex role and leadership theories, two studies were conducted using college students as research subjects. In the first study, female and male students completed the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) and a modified version of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Results showed that an initiating structure leadership style was significantly correlated with masculinity, while a consideration style of leadership was significantly correlated with femininity. Androgyny was highly correlated with both styles. In the second study, students' BSRI scores were used to classify subjects as masculine males, feminine females, or androgynous males and females. Subjects then discussed human relations problems and their verbal responses were categorized according to Bales' Interaction Process Analysis. Results indicated that females acted less stereotypically with other females than with males. Androgynous females had the highest rates of both task and social-emotional verbal output. The percentage of task-oriented statements was highest for masculine males. The findings suggest that androgynous persons may be the best leaders because of their ability to incorporate both aspects of the leadership role. (JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED208274

ANDROGYNY AND LEADERSHIP: AN INTEGRATION

Karen Korabik

University of Guelph
Canada

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karen Korabik

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 015 443

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Women in Psychology, Boston, MA, March 1981.

Androgyny and Leadership: An Integration*

Karen Korabik

University of Guelph

There are several parallels between Bales' theory of small group leadership (Bales, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1958) and Bem's theory of androgyny (Bem, 1974). Both are dialectical theories which are based on the same two underlying dimensions--instrumentality and expressiveness. Although Sampson (1977) was the first to note the similarities between these two theories, his main concern was in pointing out their difference in focus. Bem (1974) contends that instrumental and expressive qualities are integrated in the individual person and that it is the proportional representation of qualities on these two dimensions which indicates the degree to which the person is sex-typed. Bales (1953, 1955) is interested in the representation of instrumental and expressive qualities within the small group and with their effect on group functioning. Thus Sampson (1977) makes the distinction between Bem's individualistic perspective where the dialectical synthesis is within the individual and Bales' collectivistic approach where the dialectical synthesis is within an interdependent system of which the individual is a part. An alternative to either of these approaches is to

---

*A paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Women in Psychology, Boston, March, 1981. This research was supported by Social Science and Humanities Research Council Grant 410-80-0218 to the author.

CG 015443

locate the synthesis in the interaction of the person and his or her milieu. A small group is composed of individual personalities and whether certain qualities will be expressed in the group is a function of whether they exist in the individual members. Persons who have been socialized to possess instrumental or expressive personality characteristics will be likely to adopt either instrumental or expressive roles in group settings.

An integration of the theories of leadership behavior and androgyny should be beneficial to both areas. A re-examination of the small group leadership literature from an androgynous perspective sheds much light on certain problems which have been confronting researchers in that area. Recently several authors reviewing the leadership literature have noted inconsistencies in findings (Hollander, 1979; Riger & Gallegan, 1980), particularly in regard to the performance of females in same sex versus mixed sex groups and in laboratory studies versus actual positions of leadership. Much of the difficulty arises from the heavy reliance on biological sex as an explanatory concept.

Bales' original studies (1951, 1953) were done with all male groups. In such groups he found two leadership specialists emerged--a task oriented expert directed toward achievement of group goals and a social-emotional expert concerned with group morale and cohesiveness. These leadership roles are generally conceptualized as being independent and are usually filled by different people (Bales, 1955,

1958). However, a single person can and frequently does perform both functions (Lewis, 1972; Turk, 1961).

When sex differences in leadership were studied, in mixed sex groups males were found to make a higher percentage of task oriented statements than females and females to make a higher proportion of social-emotional statements than males in a wide range of situations ranging from marriage to the courtroom (Heiss, 1962; Kenkel, 1957; Lockheed & Hall, 1976; Rosmann, 1977; Strodtbeck, James & Hankins, 1957; Strodtbeck & Mann, 1956). In addition, when males and females conform to these stereotyped roles they are evaluated more favorably by others than when they deviate from them (Bartol & Butterfield, 1976; Petty & Miles, 1976). In marital decision making husbands have more influence when they use task oriented arguments, rather than social-emotional ones and wives have more influence when they use social-emotional rather than task arguments (Kenkel, 1957; Rosmann, 1977).

The literature on groups of the same biological sex, however, contains results which are quite inconsistent with those of mixed sex groups. Several studies have shown that there is no difference in the number of task oriented acts produced by males and females in same sex groups (Eskilson & Wiley, 1976; Lockheed & Hall, 1976; Megargee, 1969). One explanation for the different findings in same sex and mixed sex groups is that females may be suppressing their capacity for instrumental behavior when they are in mixed sex set-

tings. A particularly good illustration of this is a study by Megargee (1969). In groups composed of a high dominance female paired with a low dominance female, the high dominance female would adopt the leadership role. However, when a high dominance female was put with a low dominance male, in 91% of the groups the female actively delegated leadership to the male. In addition, Lockheed and Hall (1976) demonstrated that if a female first performed a task in an all female group, she was more likely to generate task oriented statements when later placed in a mixed sex group.

Studies of males and females in actual positions of leadership illustrate that persons who occupy parallel positions and perform similar functions do not differ in either leadership style or effectiveness (Chapman & Luthans, 1975; Day & Stogdill, 1972; Muldrow & Bayton, 1979; Osborn & Vicars, 1976). However, females occupying such positions may be a self-selected group. Banfield (1976) found that females in middle management positions had Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) scores which were higher in masculinity and lower in femininity than those of female University students. Along the same line, Schein (1973) has found that successful middle managers are perceived by both males and females to possess characteristics more common of men than women. As this is exactly how Bem defined masculinity on the BSRI, it appears that sex role orientation may be an important determinant of leadership style.

By focusing on biological sex as a mediator of leader-

ship, studies have mistakenly assumed bio-psychological equivalence; i.e., they have equated sex role and biological sex. Since a large proportion of our population is socialized to display role behavior which is appropriate to biological sex, these two factors covary and often are not distinguished in research designs. Bem (1974) has presented evidence that sex role orientation does not conform to the principle of bio-psychological equivalence--that not all males are masculine nor are all females feminine. Likewise, the literature in the area of leadership offers many exceptions to the task role being the exclusive function of males or the social-emotional role being the primary province of females. Although males and females often do adopt these roles in mixed sex groups, in same sex groups the same two roles still emerge. In fact, it was Bales' research (1951, 1953) with all male groups which first documented the existence of two separate leadership functions.

Bales (1953, 1958) originally conceived of the task and social-emotional functions as being complementary. He, in fact, implied that the social-emotional leader was the "real" group leader because his skills generalized from situation to situation, whereas those of the task leader were often task specific. When sex differences were examined a masculinity bias crept into the literature and leadership ability came to be associated with task orientation. Studies have shown that males are attributed more task oriented leadership ability than females are (Fallon & Hol-

lander, 1976); that task orientation is associated with the likelihood of being chosen as a leader (Eskilson & Wiley, 1976) and that social-emotional skills are not highly valued and are given low weight in determination of leadership (Slater, 1955).

The masculinity bias is still prevalent in contemporary conceptions of leadership. Social psychology textbooks continue to report that males are more leadership oriented than females, ignoring the fact that most females have been socialized to display an expressive rather than a task oriented leadership style. The importance of the integration of androgyny theory with Bales' leadership model is that it shifts the emphasis from biological sex to sex role orientation as a mediator of leadership functions. From a feminist perspective this means that females are not automatically relegated to the social-emotional role. The realization that a prerson of either sex can legitimately fill the task leader's role should actively discourage the current bias toward choosing males for task leadership positions. More importantly, however, this integration of theories should spur a return to conceptualizing leadership in terms of a dialectical synthesis of task and social-emotional functions. Hopefully, once again both of these roles will be seen as complementary and equal in importance.

The purpose of the present line of research is to provide support for the integration of sex role and leadership theories. It was hypothesized that masculine sex role

orientation would be significantly related to the use of an instrumental or task oriented leadership style and that feminine sex role orientation would be significantly related to an expressive or social-emotional leadership style. In addition, it was expected that androgynous persons would be equally likely to use both instrumental and expressive leadership styles. Finally, it was predicted that sex role orientation would be more highly related to leadership style than biological sex would be. Correlational and experimental evidence was collected to support these propositions.

Study 1

Method

The subjects were 174 female and 78 male introductory psychology students at the University of Guelph. They completed the BSRI and a modified version of the Ohio State Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The LBDQ (Stogdill & Coons, 1957) assesses two categories of leadership behavior which correspond to task oriented and social-emotional leadership as defined by Bales. These factors are 1) initiating structure which measures goal setting and attainment, and 2) consideration which deals with the establishment and maintenance of a positive group climate. These factors are supposedly independent, but empirical evidence (Schrieshein & Kerr, 1974) shows they are actually somewhat correlated.

For the purposes of this study the LBDQ was modified to make each statement into a self referent so that it became a

self report of one's own leadership behavior rather than a judgment of someone else's (e.g., "He makes his attitudes clear to the staff" was changed to "I would make my attitudes clear to the staff"). This also had the effect of removing the sex bias from the wording of the original items which were all expressed in terms of the generic "he".

Results. An initiating structure leadership style was significantly correlated with masculinity, $r(250) = .24$, $p < .001$ and a consideration style of leadership was significantly correlated with femininity, $r(250) = .48$, $p < .001$. In addition, androgyny (defined as the interaction or product of masculinity and femininity) was highly and significantly correlated with both initiating structure, $r(250) = .26$, $p < .001$, and with consideration, $r(250) = .38$, $p < .001$. Multiple regressions were calculated using structure and consideration as dependent variables and masculinity, femininity, androgyny and biological sex as predictors. These analyses demonstrated that sex role orientation was a better predictor of leadership style than was biological sex. The best predictor of a structural style of leadership was androgyny which accounted for 7% of the variance. Femininity and masculinity were the best predictors of a consideration style of leadership. Together these variables accounted for 25% of the variance, with femininity alone accounting for 23%. Biological sex, once the effect of these other variables was removed, did not significantly predict use of either an initiating structure or a consider-

ation style of leadership.

Study 2

Method

The subjects were 711 introductory psychology students at the University of Guelph who were given the BSRI. Subjects were classified as sex-typed only if the t-ratio for the difference between their mean masculinity and femininity scores was statistically significant and one score was above sample median while the other score was below the sample median. Subjects were classified as androgynous only if the t-ratio for the difference between their mean masculinity and femininity scores was <1 and both scores were above the sample medians. (SS had to pass both the t-ratio and median split criterion in order to be classified as sex-typed or androgynous). Thirty-two masculine males, 32 feminine females and 32 androgynous persons--16 male and 16 female were selected to continue with the experiment.

Four types of triads were run--each consisting of two sex-typed persons of the same sex paired with an androgynous person of either the same or opposite sex. Thus, the four types of groups were: 1) two masculine males and one androgynous male, 2) two feminine females and one androgynous male, 3) two masculine males and one androgynous female, and 4) two feminine females and one androgynous female. Eight groups of each type were run. Subjects discussed human relations problems for 75 minutes. Discussions were videotaped and the verbal output of each subject was categorized

according to Bales' (1951) Interaction Process Analysis. Statements in categories 4, 5 and 6 (gives suggestions, opinions or orientation) were classified as task oriented, while those in categories 1, 2 and 3 (agreement, solidarity or tension release) were scored as social-emotional (cf Strodtbeck & Mann, 1956). It was hypothesized that masculine persons would produce significantly more task oriented statements than feminine persons and that feminine persons would make more social-emotional statements than masculine persons. When paired with masculine males it was expected that both androgynous males and androgynous females would adopt the social-emotional leadership role; whereas, when they were paired with feminine females they were expected to adopt the task oriented role. It was also hypothesized that these roles would be more clearly differentiated in mixed sex than in same sex groups.

Results

Because of large variations in the amount of verbal output among subjects and the interdependancies of one group member's output with that of the other group members, for each subject the number of task and social-emotional statements the person made was expressed as a percentage of the total number of statements made by that person.

Insert Table 1 about here

As can be seen from Table 1, females talked more than males. Androgynous females had the highest rates of both task and social-emotional output. The percentage of task

and social-emotional statements as a function of total verbal output, however, shows a very clear relationship to the subject's sex role category. The percentage of task oriented statements was highest for masculine males. Androgynous males and females made similar percentages of task oriented comments, $p > .05$, and their percentage of task oriented output was significantly less than that of masculine males, $p < .05$, and significantly greater than that of feminine females, $p < .05$. For social-emotional statements these relationships were reversed, with feminine females making the greatest percentage of social-emotional comments. Again the out put of androgynous males and females was equivalent, $p > .05$, but their percentage of social-emotional statements was significantly less than that of feminine females, $p < .05$ and significantly greater than that of masculine males, $p < .05$.

It should be noted that feminine females actually made a higher percentage of task oriented statements than they did social-emotional statements. This is because the discussion questions, while allowing for both task and social-emotional output, were biased toward task orientation. Because the percentage of task to social-emotional output is so affected by the nature of the task, the proper comparison is the percentage of task and social-emotional output of one group of subjects relative to that of the other types of subjects.

In order to test the effects of group composition on

verbal output, percentages of task and social-emotional statements were transformed by log (x + 1). Since in each group there were two sex-typed persons for each androgynous person, the average of the sex-typed person's scores in each group was used for comparison with the androgynous person in that group. Three factor analyses of variance of the form 2 (androgynous person vs. sex-typed person) X 2 (whether the androgynous person was male or female) X 2 (same sex vs. mixed sex group) were performed with task oriented acts and social-emotional acts as dependent variables.

There was a significant interaction between androgynous male vs. female X same vs. mixed sex group for both task oriented, F (1, 56) = 6.84, $p < .05$ and social-emotional comments, F (1, 56) = 4.59, $p < .05$. There was also a significant three way interaction for both task orientation, F (1, 56) = 13.61, $p < .001$, and social-emotinal style, F (1, 56) = 12.62, p .001. The two way interaction is a subset of the three way interaction, therefore, only the latter will be discussed. The main components of this interaction are presented in the Table 2. The F values are from simple main effects analysis.

Insert Table 2 about here

In groups where masculine males were paired with an androgynous male, the masculine males made a significantly greater percentage of task oriented statements than did the androgynous males, $p < .05$, while the androgynous males made a significantly greater percentage of social-emotional

statements than did the masculine males, $p < .05$. In groups of an androgynous male with two feminine females the opposite pattern emerged, the androgynous male made a significantly greater percentage of task oriented statements than did the feminine females, $p < .05$, while the feminine females made a significantly greater percentage of social-emotional comments than did the androgynous male, $p < .05$. The third type of group was the same as the first except that the androgynous person who interacted with two masculine males was a female rather than a male. The pattern of results in these two groups was the same. Masculine males made a significantly greater percentage of task oriented statements than did the androgynous female, $p < .05$, whereas the androgynous females made a significantly greater percentage of social-emotional statements than did masculine males, $p < .05$. In the fourth type of group where an androgynous female interacted with two feminine females, the group members did not significantly differ in percentage of task or social-emotional output, $p > .05$.

In addition, for both task and social-emotional statements, the behavior of masculine males did not differ as a function of whether they interacted with an androgynous male or female, $p > .05$. Likewise, feminine females who interacted with androgynous males did not make significantly different percentages of task or social emotional statements from feminine females who interacted with androgynous females, $p > .05$. Finally, all androgynous persons, whether

male or female, behaved similarly regardless of whether they interacted with sex-typed males or females.

It was expected that androgynous persons would modify their proportion of task and social-emotional output according to the constraints of the group they were in (for instance, acting more task oriented with feminine females than with masculine males). This did not occur--they acted similarly in all groups. In this particular study, the variance accounted for by the subject's personalities was greater than that due to the group composition. It may be that with a different type of task or with a larger number of groups in each category, situational factors would be more pronounced in mixed sex than in same sex groups. There is some evidence for this with females. The significant differences which occur when feminine females interact with androgynous males disappear when they interact with an androgynous female. This is due to a slight (but non-significant) tendency for feminine females to act less stereotyped when with another female than when with a male.

Discussion

The results of these studies support the hypothesis that sex role orientation is a better predictor of leadership behavior than is biological sex. In addition, they attest to the utility of a synthesis of theoretical perspectives on androgyny and leadership.

One thing which has hampered the test of many propositions from androgyny theory is the difficulty in operation-

alizing instrumentality and expressivity in actual behavior. Often the instrumentality and expressivity of a task are confounded with the sex-stereotyping of that task. Bales' Interaction Process Analysis (1951) is content-free and, therefore, provides a method of operationalizing instrumental and expressive behavior which avoids this problem. Use of it or similar systems should allow one to test various aspects of androgyny theory.

One implication of this research is that androgynous persons may make the best leaders because of their ability to incorporate both aspects of the leadership role. A finding such as this would support Bem's (1974) contention that androgynous persons are more flexible than sex-typed persons. Not all of the implications of the results of the present research are favorable to current interpretations of androgyny theory, however. Bem (1976) has concluded that feminine females have a defecit in instrumentality. Storms (1980) has even gone so far as to suggest that feminine females should avoid engaging in even feminine sex-typed behaviors such as heating a baby bottle or winding wool because such behaviors are instrumental acts. The results of the present study, however, demonstrate that feminine females are quite instrumental in their behavior. It is only relative to masculine and androgynous persons that they are at all deficient in this area. Thus, there is a need to re-orient androgyny theory to focus on relative rather than absolute deficiencies.

One of the possible benefits of this line of research is that females displaying stereotypically feminine or social-emotional styles of leadership would be seen as making a legitimate and necessary contribution to the functioning of the group. Several studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of persons using "feminine" leadership styles. Robie (1973) has noted that traditional feminine characteristics, such as an interpersonal rather than a production orientation, may be beneficial in some work settings. There is also some evidence that females are more adept at reaching agreements than males are. In addition, females using a social-emotional leadership style are just as effective at puzzle solution (Eskilson & Wiley, 1976) and more effective at winning points in a competitive game (Bond & Vinacke, 1961) than males using a task oriented style. However, Maier (1970) has shown that in mixed sex groups with appointed leaders, although females were just as effective as males in getting the group to accept a management supplied solution, when the "facts" of the problem were supplied instead, women were less assertive and, therefore less effective than men. Therefore, the sex role constraints of the task may influence the degree to which females using social-emotional leadership styles are likely to be effective as leaders. Unfortunately, this is a variable which has been largely ignored in the literature (Hollander & Yoder, in press) and which should be explored in future studies.

References

Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Bales, R. F. Interaction process analysis. Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1951.

Bales, R. F. The equilibrium problem in small groups. In T. Parsons, R. F. Bales, & E. Shils, Working papers in the theory of action. New York: The Free Press, 1953.

Bales, R. F. How people interact at conferences. Scientific American, 1955, 192, 31-35.

Bales, R. F. Task roles and social roles in problem-solving groups in E. E. Macoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley, (Eds.) Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958.

Banfield, E. E. Women in middle management positions: Characteristics, training, leadership style, limitations, rewards, problems. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, (4-B), 1952-3.

Bartol, K. M., & Butterfield, D. A. Sex effects in evaluating leaders. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 446-454.

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S. L. Probing the promise of androgyny in A. G. Kaplan & J. P. Bean (Eds.) Beyond sex-role stereotypes: Readings toward a psychology of androgyny.

Toronto: Little, Brown, 1976.

Bond, J. R., & Vinakci, W. E. Coalitions in mixed-sex triads. Sociometry, 1961, 24, 61-65.

Chapman, J. B., & Luthans, F. The female leadership dilemma. Public Personnel Management, 1975, 4, 173-179.

Day, D. R., & Stogdill, R. M. Leader behavior of male and female supervisors: A comparative study. Personnel Psychology, 1972, 25, 353-360.

Eskilson, A., & Wiley, M. G. Sex composition and leadership in small groups. Sociometry, 1976, 39, 183-194.

Fallon, B. J., & Hollander, E. P. Sex-role stereotyping in leadership: A study of undergraduate discussion groups. A paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, 1976.

Heiss, J. S. Degree of intimacy and male-female interaction. Sociometry, 1962, 25, 197-208.

Hollander, E. P. Composition counts: The behavior of men and women in groups. A paper presented at Eastern Psychological Association, Philadelphia, April, 1979.

Hollander, E. P., & Yoder, J. Some issues comparing men and women as leaders. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, in press.

Kenkel, W. F. Differentation in family decision making. Sociology and Social Research, 1957, 42, 18-25.

Lewis, G. H. Role differentiation. American Sociological Review, 1972, 37, 424-434.

Lockheed, M. E., & Hall, K. P. Conceptualizing sex as a status characteristic: Applications to leadership training strategies. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 111-124.

Maier, N. R. Male versus female discussion leaders. Personnel Psychology, 1970, 23, 455-461.

Megargee, E. L. Influence of sex roles on the manifestation of leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 377-382.

Muldrow, T. W., & Bayton, J. A. Men and women executives and processes related to decision accuracy. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1979, 64, 99-106.

Osborn, R. N. & Vicars, M. W. Sex stereotypes: An artifact in leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction analysis? Academy of Management Journal, 1976, 19, 439-449.

Petty, M. M., & Miles, R. H. Leader sex role stereotyping in a female dominated work culture. Personnel Psychology, 1976, 29, 393-404.

Riger, S., & Galligan, P. Women in management: An exploration of competing paradigms. American Psychologist, 1980, 35, 902-910.

Robie, E. A. Challenge to management. In E. Ginzberg & A. Yohalem (Eds) Corporate lib: Women's challenge to management. Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Rosmann, M. R. Differential effects of task structure and expectancy set on family leadership. Dissertation

Abstracts International, 1977, (10-B), 5373.

Sampson, E. E. Psychology and the American ideal. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35, 767-782.

Schein, V. E. The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 95.

Schriesheim, C., & Kerr, S. Psychometric properties of the Ohio State Leadership scales. Psychological Bulletin, 1974, 81, 756-65.

Slater, P. E. Role differentiation in small groups. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 300-310.

Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. Leader behavior: It's description and measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1957.

Storms, M. Sex role identity and its relationships to sex role attributes and sex role stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1779-1789.

Strodtbeck, F. L., James, R. M., & Hankins, C. Social status in jury deliberations. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 713-719.

Strodtbeck, F. L., & Mann, R. D. Sex role differentiation in jury deliberations. Sociometry, 1956, 19, 3-11.

Turk, H. Instrumental and expressive ratings reconsidered. Sociometry, 1961, 24, 76-81.